

REMARKS

Applicants respond hereby to the Office Action mailed on November 10, 2010. The Office Action rejects claims 1-8 and 11-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2004/0233054 to Neff, et al. (Neff) in view of US Patent No. 7,333,015 to Ekström (Ekström) and rejects claim 9 over Neff in view of US Patent Appln. Pub. No. 2004/0263332 to Maple, et al. (Maple).

To support the rejection over Neff in view of Ekström, the Examiner asserts that Neff discloses a device 20 for registering an opening of a closure (door) of spaces (container or cargo) to be secured comprising a sealing module 21 having a sensor 22 (pars. [0019]-[0022]), a first microprocessor 48, a first memory (tag memory), and a first wireless communication device (RFID tag 54), where the sealing module attachable to the closure in such a way that the sensor 22 detects a movement of the closure (par. [0020]) and outputs movement data, the movement data being written into the first memory; and

a detection unit (readers, mobile devices, laptops, desktops, fixed devices 30) having at least one (second) wireless communication device (RF transceiver; par. [0016]) for communication with the sealing module, a second microprocessor (reader controller), and a second memory (reader memory), the second microprocessor reading out at least the movement data (fault signal data) documenting movement of the closure from the first memory and writing the movement data into the second memory for later review on a display as seen in Figs. 1-4 (pars. [0016]-[0030]).

The Examiner further asserts that Neff fails to disclose a WLAN interface in the detection unit (reader 30) for sending and receiving data including the content using WLAN technology to/from a database and central computer, but that Ekström teaches a system with a monitoring device 12 attached to a cargo/container 10 for communicating door breach data to a plurality of readers 16 in a handheld device 16a, mobile device 16b and fixed device 16c, which readers communicate via a network 13 including WLAN using a WLAN interface to a server 15 and software backbone 17 at a central computer for performing surveillance services including tracing and securing containers via server 15, readers 16 and devices 12.

The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to implement Ekström's WLAN interface in the Neff's readers 30 to enable communication of data from and to at least one database and a central computer to perform surveillance services including tracking and securing containers in grand scale, as taught by Ekström.

In response, applicants hereby amend independent claims 1 and 16 as shown above in the Listing of Claims in order to more clearly distinguish the invention as claimed from Neff as modified by the teachings of Ekström and/or Maple.

For example, independent claim 1 as amended now clearly recites a device for monitoring door sealing of a closure having a predetermined quantity of N doors. The device comprises at least N sealing modules (1) that each

include a sensor (6), a first microprocessor (4), a first memory (5), and a first wireless communication device (2, 3), and which sealing modules are each configured to be attached to a respective one of the N doors in such a way that the sensor (6) detects a movement of the specific door and outputs movement data of the movement, which movement data is written into the first memory (5).

The device further comprises a detection unit (11) and a WLAN interface (18). The detection unit (11) has at least one second wireless communication device (13, 14) for communication with the at least N sealing modules (1), a second microprocessor (12), and a second memory (15) for reading out at least the movement data from the first memory (5) and writing the movement data into the second memory (15). The WLAN interface (18) is disposed in the detection unit (11) for sending and receiving data including the movement data to and from at least one of a database and a central computer by WLAN technology.

The detection unit (11) is configured to check movement data recorded in any of the at least N sealing modules, in a menu-controlled predefined sequence, and correspondingly displaying a checking status.

Neff's detection unit or readers 30 are not configured to check movement data recorded in any of the at least N sealing modules 21, in a menu-controlled predefined sequence, and correspondingly displaying a checking status.

Ekström fails to overcome the shortcomings of Neff. That is, Ekström merely teaches a system for monitoring the integrity of a freight container, which is assumed to be entered through a single door, or closure means. Ekström

does not teach or suggest a device for monitoring door sealing of a closure having a predetermined quantity of N doors with at least N sealing modules that each include a sensor configured for attachment to one of the respective N doors, etc., nor a detection unit configured to check movement data recorded in any of the at least N sealing modules (received by the detection unit), in a menu-controlled predefined sequence, and correspondingly displaying a checking status, as claimed.

Accordingly, amended independent claims 1 and 16 would not have been obvious over Neff in view of Ekström, and even if Neff were modified according to what is taught by Ekström, the modified Neff system still would not realize a device or method as claimed.

Applicants respectfully assert, therefore, that claims 1-8 and 11-23 are not obvious under §103(a) over Neff in view of Ekström, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections thereunder.

In response to the rejection of claim 9 under §103(a) over Neff in view of Maple, applicants respectfully assert that Maple suffers the same limitations of Neff and Ekström, as explained above in response to the rejection of independent claim 1, from which claim 9 depends. Hence, claim 9 is non-obvious and therefore patentable under §103(a) over Neff in view of Maple for at least the same reasons and applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

It follows that the application is in condition for allowance. Action to this end is courteously solicited. However, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27,233
103 East Neck Road
Huntington, New York 11743
631 549 4700